

# Our Times-Dispatch

DAILY—WEEKLY—SUNDAY.

Business Office.....115 E. Main Street,  
 Manchester Bureau.....1105 Hull Street,  
 Petersburg Bureau.....10 N. Spotswood St.,  
 Lynchburg Bureau.....215 Eighth St.

BY MAIL: One Year, \$10.00; Three Months, \$3.00; One Month, \$1.00.  
 Daily without Sunday.....\$1.00  
 Sunday edition only......50  
 Weekly (Wednesday), 1.00 .50 .25

By Times-Dispatch Carrier Delivery Service in Richmond (and suburbs), Manchester and Petersburg—

One Week, Daily with Sunday.....10 cents  
 Daily without Sunday.....5 cents  
 Sunday only.....5 cents

Entered January 27, 1903, at Richmond, Va., as second-class matter under act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1909.

## INTOLERABLE HUNGELING.

By all means let the Grounds and Buildings Committee offer the Weather Bureau a site certain to be rejected. Let it discover that Chimborazo Park is not suited for a weather bureau at all. Let the Council reopen the whole matter and find that, after all, Riverside is the place. Let three more residents who fear interference with their northern light come forward with another "monster petition"—so easy to get—and disrupt the city's plans again. Let us repeat our post-office bickering until we are weary, and then let the United States government give the bureau to Atlanta, or Memphis, or some other Southern city more disposed to take advantage of its opportunities.

Here is a proposal that won the instant and warm endorsement of all our commercial organizations, of a unanimous press, of every disinterested citizen in Richmond. It is a matter which, if it had been personal instead of municipal, any intelligent business man could have settled within a week. It is insufferable that the city should have haggled and wrangled for months over it, and accomplished nothing beyond demonstrating the entire incapacity of its administrative system for quick, clean-cut and decisive work. The loss of the bureau will be a monument to that system which will not soon be forgotten. It is possible that Richmond may not lose this building, but the stark fact remains that she fully and richly deserves to do so.

## A WASHINGTON-RICHMOND ROAD.

Senator Bacon's suggestion that the proposed Lincoln memorial highway might better lie between Washington and Richmond than Washington and Gettysburg is warmly seconded by the Atlanta Journal. To the Journal the building of a splendid memorial road between Washington and this city "suggests a wedding of the sections, a bridging of the bloody chasm, a pledge of enduring fraternity and good will." In similar vein we find one of the ablest of Northern journals, the Springfield Republican, commenting thus:

Clearly if a highway memorial to Lincoln is to be established, the Washington-Richmond road must be considered more appropriate. It would unite the capitals of the two sections in the war of which Lincoln was the guiding spirit on the Northern side, and, as the Atlanta paper says, it would be emblematic of the welding of these sections on the basis of freedom, which was the great purpose of the conflict, as finally led by Lincoln. He made no immortal speech at Richmond, but he went there or into that vicinity more times than he ever went to Gettysburg, and it was in that direct Washington-Richmond road that he was generally to be watched. Such a road would run close by many battlefields, and every inch of its ground would be historic of the great sectional struggle.

The Springfield Republican is not ordinarily considered a violent partisan advocate of things Southern. Its views on such a matter may be safely taken as fairly representative of thoughtful opinion everywhere. There can be, indeed, no question of the greater interest and dignity of a Washington-Richmond highway than a similar one to Gettysburg. Symbolically, a road linking the two capitals of war days would have a depth of meaning which would be entirely wanting in any other road. More practically, it would be far more used and offer far more of interest to the traveler. Built, like a Roman road, to last 1,000 years, it would link Lincoln's name with a great public work of use to unnumbered thousands, and so with this conception of public service which he stood for. Could he be honored in any nobler or more lasting way?

## AS TO "DEMOCRATIC PROTECTION."

As we gather from certain signs and indications, our esteemed friend, the Petersburg Index-Appeal, is considerably annoyed by our inability to distinguish between its own high protection arguments and those made familiar, let us say, by the Republicans of the Massachusetts woolens district. Continued obtuseness is irritating to others and mortifying to ourselves; and we have therefore courted instruction. The whole trouble is with the Index-Appeal's staunch contention that its high protection position is soundly and essentially Democratic. In support of this, it cites a somewhat vague and incomplete excerpt from Mr. Jefferson, dealing, in so far as the quoted part indicates, not with protection at all, but with the revenue only; and another comment from Andrew Jackson, based upon the peculiar trade situation existing in 1824. We should like to have Mr. Jefferson's argument for high protection, in especial, quoted more fully than the Index-Appeal has yet presented it. It will then be time enough, doubtless, to offer a few thoughts in rebuttal.

Our Petersburg neighbor has further fortified its position by a citation from the St. Louis platform of 1888, in which

year, it will be remembered, Mr. Cleveland sustained his only defeat. The gist of this reminiscence is: "A fair and careful revision of our tax laws, with due allowance for the difference between the wages of American and foreign labor, must promote and encourage every branch of such industries and enterprises." This, we are told, is exactly the kind of protection that Representative Lassiter and the Index-Appeal want for home peanuts, and this, it is said, is the old-time Democratic doctrine. How far this twenty-year-old declaration was generally understood at the time as an endorsement of the protective principle may perhaps be gleaned from the Republican platform, framed a few days later, which declared: "We are uncompromisingly in favor of the American system of protection; we protest against its destruction as proposed by the President and his party."

But much more pertinent, no doubt, would be the resurrection of the platform of 1892, which our Petersburg friend passes by, but upon which the Democratic party won the greatest victory of its life. This platform, after referring to protection in the most uncompromising manner, declared it "to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties except for the purposes of revenue only." This is a much simpler and more direct statement of Democratic principle than was offered in 1888. It is not complicated and bedeviled with those theories of wage differentials which practice has proved to be so conveniently elastic. Why should our Petersburg neighbor expect us to ignore it?

Really, it would not be difficult to show from platform excerpts how closely the Index-Appeal's statement of its own tariff beliefs approaches those professed through many campaigns by the Republican party. But we cheerfully waive that. Let us assume that our neighbor's statement of principles is, as it says, soundly and historically Democratic. This statement it conveniently sums up for us in the following sentence:

The Index-Appeal believes in protecting home industries in the interest of American labor, until they are able to take care of themselves in competition with foreign enterprises, and no longer.

Admit that Jefferson and all the rest of them would have commended this as a sound expression of essential Democracy, and then let us ask if it is altogether adequate, full and ingenious. Has the saying "no longer," in fact, any application whatever to the present discussion? Our neighbor has already answered. On account of disadvantages in "natural conditions of soil and climate," so it told us the other day, the Virginia peanut industry "must always be an infant in a tariff sense." Can the Index-Appeal fairly say that it is asking for protection "until" the peanut-growers "are able to take care of themselves in competition with foreign enterprises"? It is frankly asking for it forever. If it really means to maintain that perpetual high protection based on irremediable natural disadvantages is sound Democratic doctrine, we should be greatly interested in seeing further corroborative citations from Jefferson, Jackson and the party platforms.

## CONGRESS AND THE CENSUS SPOILS.

Why should it be necessary for the President to have to resort to the extreme of a veto to save the country from the evils of a spoils system census bill? We are told that the sentiment in Congress for this kind of bill is so strong that it may pass by a two-to-one vote. Yet there is absolutely no argument for it higher than that of the pie-counter. Congressmen desire to swing patronage to friends back home who could never qualify under a competitive system. That is the whole case for the bill in its present form. Experience in the last census made it plain that the clerks employed under an appointive system were of a distinctly inferior grade to those employed under the civil service—so much so that the completion of a census with them will take a year or two longer and cost some \$2,000,000 or \$3,000,000 more. Yet individual Congressmen are quite willing, it seems, to punish the nation to that extent in order to fasten upon their standing with the district voters.

Mr. Roosevelt's refusal to countenance this interesting program will have the approval of disinterested persons everywhere. Congress will hardly venture to re-enact the bill over his veto, unless it develops more backbone in dealing with the White House than it ordinarily exhibits. But will it not be an amazing thing if it enacts at all, in the full eye of the country, a bill opposed by the overwhelming weight of public opinion, and capable of defense on no creditable grounds whatever? As a matter of fact, how far do the people rule anyway?

## FOR MUNICIPAL REFORM IN BOSTON.

The Boston Charter Revision Committee, which has just reported to the Massachusetts Legislature, has mapped out a plan for municipal government whose operation in practice will be watched with no little interest. The evils which gave rise to the demand for a new charter originated with corrupt politics, working through a cumbersome system of government; and the plan now recommended aims both to simplify the system and to minimize the influence of politics. To begin with, the bicameral chamber, made up of thirteen Aldermen and seventy-five Councilmen, is to be replaced by a single chamber of nine members, elected at large. Their powers are to be restricted, and those of the Mayor, who will wield an absolute veto, are to be greatly enlarged. For instance, he may remove any subordinate city

officer at large. Moreover, these subordinates can be appointed only after a satisfactory examination as to their special fitness by the State Civil Service Commission. The Mayor's term is for four years, but he may be turned out at the end of two by a popular vote. Nominations for office are absolutely nonpartisan and divorced from all jiggery. They are made on petition of 5,000 registered voters, and the ballot is to bear no party designation of any kind whatever.

Experience will be necessary, of course, to test this plan. On paper it looks very good indeed, embodying, as it does, independent nominations, a small, centralized and responsible governing body and appointments for qualifications rather than for pull. A plan of this sort seems to be out of the question for Richmond just now, inasmuch as the Constitution appears to have condemned us to the two-chambered Council. But the simplification of numbers, which was the first aim of the Boston commission, is easily enough attained. A start was made in the ordinance offered by Councilman Cutchins the other night, providing for a reduction of the number of Councilmen and Aldermen from thirty-five and twenty-one, respectively, to twenty-one and fourteen. This bill was referred to committee without debate. What possible argument can be advanced against it? And now that we are on the topic, why should not Richmond also have a charter commission to study plans of municipal government and recommend modifications in an administrative system which can hardly be giving entire satisfaction to her citizens?

How some of our Northern friends who are just now showering Lincoln with eulogy would be waiting all over him if he were alive to-day!

Railroads do not seem to mind being harrassed, either.

The final meeting of the Annapolis Club will be on the evening of March 3, as previously advertised. It is gratifying to find that a few liberals in government are going to let quietly loose that night.

The Paragraphers' Union contemplates petitioning the Ways and Means Committee for stiff protection from book agents.

A much esteemed Washington contemporary speaks of "Mr. Charles Fletcher," who preaches "Jesus eating and more chewing." And this is Horace Fletcher's reward for ten years' dreary mastication, reiterated till his jaws ached him and ground aloud for mercy.

The one thing that seems absolutely plain about that notorious steel merger is that it merged.

A town like Kennebunkport, Maine, or Boston (Mass.) would sell its soul for February days like these.

While experience is doubtless a dear teacher, few have been overheard referring to it as a darling.

"The Prince de Sagan," muses the Washington Herald, "has just purchased 100 new waists." Plainly Helle aspires to be known as the Tim Woodruff of Paris, France.

These warm February days remind us that the amazing ball team of Richmond has resigned forever from the Tallenters' Association and devoted the summer months to the augmentation of its stock of pennants.

It is plain that the poor old ground-hog could never drive a delivery wagon till he acquired for once skill in coming across with the goods.

There is no question that returning tourists, especially when female, from time to time have great trouble in disclosing to some one somebody. Therefore, Mr. Loeb will doubtless find his work as collector of the port in New York falling into familiar lines.

"Ware Mr. Harriman the archangel Gabriel," begins the New York Evening Post. Oh, I say, fawney, now! Fawney!

Navy bureau chiefs, when they work nights, burn a red taper.

## JAPANESE IN AMERICA.

Total Number Only 7,712, According to Census.

The population of California, according to the last census, was 1,435,053, and is now much larger. The total number of Japanese in the United States in the four States of California, Colorado, Utah and Nevada and the Territory of Arizona is 4,183, according to official figures. All told, the Japanese government does not know of more than 7,712 Japanese in the whole United States, of whom 3,403 are in Oregon and 1,723 in Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, Washington and Alaska. It is utterly ridiculous to speak of the engulfing of 80,000,000 of Anglo-Saxons by such a mere handful of Japanese. It is a matter of fact that the Japanese are a most industrious and able people. The latter—New York Evening Post.

## PORTABLE DWELLINGS.

Italians Sufferers to Receive Practical Aid in New York.

The first of a series of portable wooden houses to Italy, bought out of the congressional appropriation for the earthquake sufferers, should prove not only a practical form of philanthropy, but an exhibit really instructive to the Sicilians. It may lead to improved housing conditions in the districts where the new structures are located. Italy years ago so ravaged her forests that lumber is too valuable a material to be used in that country for building purposes. The average Italian never sees anything but stone construction, and it is not until he comes to a country where it makes a danger almost unknown, but, unfortunately—even in the smallest country towns—the houses are added to the stone and built in light and ventilation with whole families all too often crowded into a single room. According to a recent consular report, the houses which the United States is sending are of two types, one of which is of two rooms, with seven windows and a chimney, and the other of an Italian peasant will be a marvelous spectacle in Sicily or Calabria, and may stimulate the desire for cleanliness and better living—New York Evening Post.

## PLAYGROUNDS IN BOSTON.

The money now invested in Boston's playgrounds is \$2,528,000, and the yearly cost of maintenance \$60,000, and the city is now planning for the acquisition of \$105,000 for further extension. In just what manner the movement will be extended in Boston is at present in question. That we are not long behind New York and Chicago seems certain from the unbroken line of exhibition grounds, schools and parks alike—Boston Transcript.

# Borrowed Jingles

THE GARBOYLE.

[Note.—Not Congressman Williams.]

The Garboyle often makes its perch on a cathedral or a church. Where, mid ecclesiastical style, It sits, its early morning smile, And while the sun is glancing, Speaks at his weary flock inside, Spouts at the people in the street, And like the parson, seems to say, "To those beneath him, 'Let us pray.'"

Like the Garboyle, he plays so cheerfully on rainy days, "While parsons (no one can deny) Are awfully solemn when they pray."

—Oliver Herford, in the Century.

## MERELY JOKING.

The Real Facts.

About Ben Adhem protested.

"Merely mention that I scatter ashes on my walk, and he is dead," he cried.

And to his name led all the rest—New York Sun.

## Distress Signal.

The beautiful maiden was suffering from loneliness.

"Yes," said the telephone: "C. Q. D."

Her dearest understood, He came quickly—Chicago Tribune.

## Well-Groomed.

Mrs. Wabash: "She's had six weddings in."

Mrs. Dearborn: "What? Been a bride six times?"

"Yes," said she, "I think of that."

"I think you might call her a well-groomed woman,"—Yonkers Statesman.

## Why?

Bobby: "You don't distrust me any more, do you?"

Johnny: "No, dear."

Bobby: "Why, do you continue to hide the pie?"—Harper's Weekly.

## Good Reasons.

Jones: "Why can't a woman keep a secret?"

Smith: "For one of two reasons—either she can't keep, or else it is too good to keep."—Judge.

## Realistic.

Bill: "How was the desert scene in the play?"

Jim: "Great! Every boy's throat was so dry that they had to go out to wet up!"—Yonkers Statesman.

## PERTINENT POINTS.

JUST now in Washington the imminence of the new broom appears to overshadow the importance of the big stick.—Innopolis News.

There is now \$25 in currency for every man, woman and child in the country. Have you got yours?—Philadelphia Inquirer.

President Obaldia, of Panama, says the Rainey season is most unpleasant.—New York Mail.

The Baby Emperor, Pu Yi, is more concerned with the milk question than with the opium problem.—New York Evening Post.

This determined movement to keep Loeb in the public service may be prompted by the hope that he will not go out to wet up!—Yonkers Statesman.

The Prince de Sagan has just purchased 100 new waists. This must have impressed his wife as being quite a characteristic investment, as it were.—Washington Herald.

## PERSONAL AND GENERAL.

There are 3,000 islands in Lake Huron, Jamaica sugar plantations raise about 2,000 pounds to the acre.

The telephone business is picking up in China. Peking has over 1,700 subscribers.

The average life of a plate of glass is ten years, as shown by plate-glass insurance records.

Rumania is the most illiterate country of Europe, two-thirds of its inhabitants cannot read nor write.

In spite of the general decrease in imports in Brazil during 1908 there was an increase in imports of fresh fruit.

The city of Tampico has awarded a contract to the Compania Mexicana de Pavimentos de Asfalto y Construcciones, of Mexico City, for paving the principal streets with asphalt at a cost of \$400,000.

Korea will be represented at Seattle by an exhibit of brass wares, carved woods, silks and silks.

An exporter in Seoul is preparing for the 1909 exhibition to show the progress of the Pacific country.

The death in Cleveland, O., of Mrs. Flora S. Sather, wife of Samuel Mather, discloses in her will many handsome gifts for education and philanthropic institutions.

Miss Anne Morgan, daughter of Mr. Pierpont Morgan, as a member of the Woman's Auxiliary of the National Civil Federation, has been elected to inspect the establishments in which women are employed.

Bedford, O., has lost its oldest resident, James Fuller, who was 101 years old. At the time of his death he was the oldest man who had been eighty years a voter, was taken to the polls by the Mayor and cast his vote for the late President Cleveland for whom he had voted.

The home in Princeton, N. J., where Grover Cleveland lived after his retirement from the presidency, is for sale, and is advertised for sale. The house is full of delightful memories for the people of the town and Princeton University, and there will be local interest in the Cleveland family is to leave it.

## TARIFF ON COFFEE.

Breakfast Table Autostrats Will Not Stand for It.

We have always favored a "free breakfast table," and we will not now countenance the proposal that the drinker of coffee shall be taxed and the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, be thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.

It is a matter of fact that the grocer, by attempting to evade the percolator, is thus deprived of three-fourths of his business.